

**RESPONSE**

Claims 1-18, and 23-33 are pending in the present application.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-11, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belloch et. al. (US 5,768,594), in view of Schlansker et. al. (US 5,710,912), and further in view of Krishna et. al. (US 6,161,173), and further in view of Akkary et. al. (US 6,493,820). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner.

Even if the combination suggested by the Examiner were made, it would still not anticipate the claimed invention because not all claim elements are taught by the combination. For example, regarding independent claims 1, and 24, the combination does not teach the Applicant's claimed limitation of "the number of said plurality of programs that are interleaved is greater than or equal to the depth of the pipeline." Since a prima facie showing of obviousness must teach all of the claim limitations, the rejection of claims 1 and 24 is moot.

Dependent claims 2, 4-7, and 9-11 are dependent on a now allowable base claim, and are themselves allowable.

Examiner has rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belloch et. al. (US 5,768,594) in view of Schlansker et. al. (US 5,710,912), and further in view of Krishna et. al. (US 6,161,173), and further in view of Akkary et. al. (US

6,493,820) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Nguyen et. al. (US 5,961,628).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Since the claim is dependent on a now allowable base claim, its rejection is moot.

The Examiner has rejected claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belloch et. al. (US 5,768,594) in view of Schlansker et. al. (US 5,710,912), and further in view of Krishna et. al. (US 6,161,173), and further in view of Akkary et. al. (US 6,493,820) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Narayanaswami (US 5,973,705). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Since the claims are dependent on a now allowable base claim, their rejection is moot.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 14-18, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belloch et. al. (US 5,768,594) in view of Schlansker et. al. (US 5,710,912), and further in view of Krishna et. al. (US 6,161,173), and further in view of Akkary et. al. (US 6,493,820) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Naini et. al. (US 6,209,083). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner.

Regarding independent claims 14 and 23, the combination suggested by the Examiner does not anticipate the claimed invention because it does not teach all elements of the claimed invention. For example, regarding independent claims 14 and 23, the combination does not teach the Applicant's claimed limitation of "no no-op is inserted into the pipeline for the purpose of ensuring that said next instruction is not provided to said pipeline until said previous instruction has competed." Since a prima facie showing

of obviousness must teach all of the claim limitations, the rejection of claims 14 and 23 is moot.

Dependent claims 3, and 15-18 are dependent on a now allowable base claim, and are themselves allowable.

The Examiner has rejected claims 25-33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akkary et. al. (US 6,493,820). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner.

Regarding independent claim 25, Applicant contends that the combination does not anticipate the claimed invention because the combination does not teach all elements of the claimed invention. For example, the combination does not teach the Applicant's claimed limitation of "a target program counter coupled to a plurality of program counters." Since a prima facie showing of obviousness must teach all of the claim limitations, the rejection of claim 25 is moot.

Regarding independent claims 32 and 33, the combination suggested by the Examiner does not anticipate the claimed invention because it does not teach all elements of the claimed invention. For example, regarding claim 32, the combination does not teach the Applicant's claimed limitation of "implementing said instructions in one or more pipelined units wherein each of said instructions is issued to said one or more units in each cycle." Since a prima facie showing of obviousness must teach all of the claim limitations, the rejection of claim 32 is moot. Similarly, regarding claim 33, the combination does not teach the Applicant's claimed limitation of "assigning a first output

register slot to a first of plurality of programs." Since a prima facie showing of obviousness must teach all of the claim limitations, the rejection of claim 33 is moot.

Dependent claims 26-31 are dependent on a now allowable base claim and are themselves allowable.